

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an in person interview on February 12, 2007.

Claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18-69 were pending at the time of the Office Action with claims 19-69 withdrawn. Claims 1 and 4 are hereby amended. Claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18-69 remain pending with claims 19-69 withdrawn.

In the Office Action mailed November 21, 2006, claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the acknowledged prior art in the "Background of the Invention" in the present application ("APA") in view of Sogg ("An Integrated Systems Approach to Human Factors in Commerical Aviation Maintenance Systems"); Eiff ("At-Risk Safety Metric – A Proactive Safety Measurement Strategy"); and Bieda et al. (US 2003/0171897 "Bieda"). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

As discussed in the interview, independent Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

searching, with the data processing device, a database for at least two potential human errors resulting from the human activity, the at least two potential human errors resulting from the human activity being related to the at least one verb extracted by the data processing device;
transmitting, from the data processing device, an output representing the at least two potential human errors;
receiving, at the data processing device, an input representing which of the at least two potential human errors were selected for evaluation;

transmitting, from the data processing device, an output representing the human error or errors selected for evaluation...


As discussed and agreed to in the interview, the cited art does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, neither the APA, Sogg, Eliff nor Bieda teach and/or disclose at least “searching, with the data processing device, a database for at least two potential human errors resulting from the human activity, the at least two potential human errors resulting from the human activity being related to the at least one verb extracted by the data processing device; transmitting, from the data processing device, an output representing the at least two potential human errors; receiving, at the data processing device, an input representing which of the at least two potential human errors were selected for evaluation; and transmitting, from the data processing device, an output representing the human error or errors selected for evaluation.” Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the APA in view of Sogg, Eliff, and Bieda.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit pending claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3/1/2007

By: 
Rustan J. Hill
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 37,351
(206) 315-4001 x113

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER